DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 472 EA 016 035

AUTHOR Wisniewski, Richard; Kleine, Paul
TITLE Teacher Moonlighting: An Unstudied Phenomenon.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Elementary Secondary Education; *Multiple Employment; Statistical Surveys; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

A sample of 4,100 Oklahoma teachers was surveyed to clarify the extent and impact of moonlighting, defined as earning any income beyond the contractual teaching salary. Of the 1,103 teachers returning the mailed questionnaires, 44 percent engaged in moonlighting within the school system, 31.4 percent had jobs evenings and weekends, 41.5 percent took summer jobs, and 28.8 percent made money from family businesses. Over the past 3 years, 71 percent (90 percent of men and 65 percent of women responding) had earned some income from one or more of these sources. Questioned on their motives for moonlighting, nearly three quarters indicated a need for extra money to pay debts or to raise their living standard. Asked their perceptions of the impact of moonlighting, 20 percent felt that it adversely affected their teaching performance and 29 percent thought that it hindered their preparation for teaching. Over half (58.5 percent) believed that moonlighting hindered family and social activities. When asked to choose a statement approximating their views, 44.3 percent found moonlighting degrading to the profession and another 20.2 percent considered it a necessary evil. Only 14.4 percent said that some jobs they had taken enhanced their performance as educators. The findings constitute a case for increasing teacher salaries so as to reduce moonlighting and raise the status of the profession. (MJL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# TEACHER MOONLIGHTING: AN UNSTUDIED PHENOMENON

ED233472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Richard Wisniewski

Paul Kleine

University of Oklahoma

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Wisniewski
Paul Kleine
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## INTRODUCTION

The holding of multiple jobs by teachers, or moonlighting as it is commonly known, is essentially an unstudied phenomenon. Few studies of moonlighting exist. Only a handful of references were gleaned from library and information retrieval sources. While widely recognized as a characteristic of the profession, the incidence of moonlighting is not well-documented.

The extent of moonlighting among teachers appears to be very significant. A 1982 National Education Association report states that about half of all teachers surveyed work at other jobs to supplement their teaching salaries, earning an average of $2,462 in extra income from these activities.[1] If this proportion is correct, the ramifications of this widespread practice deserve far more than a passing glance.

The relationship between moonlighting and poor teaching salaries is clear. For example, one new teacher responded to a reporter's inquiry regarding her financial rewards for staying in the profession with: "It's hard to look across the hall and see a teacher who's taught 14 years, making only $4,000 more than you are."[2] Given what Lortie has described as "front-loaded" salary scales,[3] i.e., where there is no major change from beginning to experienced teacher salaries, many teachers must find supplementary employment to enhance their standard of living.

---

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983.

EA 016 035

It also appears that educators lead all groups needing to supplement their income. A 1978 study of multiple job holding in all activities found that an average of 4.8% of all employed workers held more than one job. Among the professions that exceeded 8% for workers were persons in education, state and local government offices, and the post office. Of these groups, the highest proportion of persons with second jobs (20%) were teachers below the college level.[4] The study suggests that teacher's work schedules may be conducive to taking part-time jobs. This explanation identifies a facilitative factor rather than a root cause.

The discrepancy between the NEA estimate of 50% of teachers moonlighting and 20% in the latter study, as well as other estimates, is not easily explained because of the limited research on the subject. The findings of our study exceed the NEA estimate. Whatever the accurate figure, the incidence of moonlighting among teachers is socially significant. There is no doubt that several hundred thousand teachers engage in a variety of part-time employment.

While studies of the phenomenon are rare, popular treatments of the subject occasionally appear. The Instructor, for example, offers an upbeat reinforcement of the fact that moonlighting is common among teachers in an article titled "You Can Moonlight in the Sunlight with these Moneymaking Ideas." Listed are a number of activities for which teachers have the skills: wedding planning, conducting fitness or exercise classes, typing research papers, tutoring, housepainting, and so on.[5]

U. S. News and World Report examines the nation's estimated five million moonlighters and points out that "teachers are constantly targeted by firms that need extra workers, quoting one teacher who reports that: "Stores, in particular, send letters and direct advertising to us."[6] Another article quotes Ernest Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, as stating "For many teachers, moonlighting is essential." He also suggests the obvious alternative: Better financial rewards are among changes needed to improve the quality of teaching in America.[7]

Over a 35 year period, only five major studies of moonlighting among teachers were identified. All are dissertations, with the most recent being completed in 1969. All five describe moonlighting practices in different states. The most comprehensive study was completed in 1948 by Stuart A. Anderson: "A Study of the Professional Pesonnel of Wisconsin Secondary Schools with Special References to Extra-Contractual Income." Anderson discusses the economic and professional status of teachers, including a range of personal data. The critical finding is that 58.3% of his sample of secondary teachers had supplementary incomes beyond their contractual salaries, i.e. 76.2% of the male and 41.4% of the female teachers had extra incomes.[8]

Almost 20 years later, Melvin LeRoy Tucker completed "A Study of the Salary-Supplemental Activities of Utah Public School Teachers." His survey indicated that 90.7 percent of male teachers and 32.1 percent of female teachers supplemented their salaries through moonlighting, for an overall percentage of 65.6 percent. One of his supplementary statements would seem to apply to all of the studies noted here:

> The data tabulated here will probably not be surprising to most public school teachers. They have probably engaged in some salary supplementing activities themselves, but were not aware of how widespread the practice was. When we consider that 90.7 percent of the men teachers of Utah who taught during the school year 1961-62 and who responded in the study, had income in addition to their contractual salary, the teacher-reader of this study who has a part-time or summer job is not alone...[9]

The estimate of 90.7 percent for male teachers is reinforced by our study and is the highest figure reported in all the studies; if accurate, it is an incredible finding.

In 1968, George Harris Gumm reported his study of "Salary Supplementing Activities of Male Public School Teachers in Tennessee." Based on a sample of 900 male public school teachers, Gumm reported that 56.67 percent received additional income from a source other than a school system. 35.23 percent received supplemental income from the school system.[10]

Charles Parker in his 1969 study of "Salary Supplementing Activities of Male Public School Teachers in Missouri" sampled 750 male teachers and reported 53.08 percent as having earned income from sources outside the school system, and 42.94

percent reporting income for additional duties performed for the schools.[11] It is surprising that the latter studies focused exclusively on male teachers. While value judgments may be implicit in this fact, it is sufficient to state that moonlighting studies that do not survey all teachers are open to question.

The doctoral dissertation by William Anderson is the most relevant of the major studies identified. In 1966, Anderson completed a supplemental income survey of over 13,000 teachers and counselors in the State of Oklahoma which provides an excellent backdrop for the present study. Based on the 1963-64 school year, the following findings were reported.

1) Sixty nine percent of male teachers reported outside employment during the school year or during the summer compared with 19% of female teachers.

2) Those teachers engaged in supplemental employment worked an average of 11 hours per week earning an average of $1,096 per year.[12]

While no data were presented on teacher perceptions, the study did report several interesting findings on superintendents' attitudes. While 89% of all superintendents felt moonlighting hindered the teaching effectiveness of classroom teachers and only 38% approved of the practice, 92% felt it was necessary for teachers to moonlight and 77% reported that they had been involved in outside employment during their own careers as classroom teachers. Additionally, 25% indicated they currently had a farm or other type of business that took time from their school administration chores and 20% reported they held a non-school job during the previous summer.

All five studies present much additional information, some of which parallel data solicited in our survey. Given the dated nature of these studies as well as the complexity of examining variables influencing moonlighting, only three conclusions are drawn from these studies: (1) the high percentages of moonlighting reported; (2) moonlighting is not a new phenomenon; and (3) it has not received widespread

attention particularly in recent years. These studies and their useful bibliographies indicate that moonlighting is common among teachers. There is no doubt that moonlighting deserves more study to determine its extent and impact on teaching. Discussions of professionalism among teachers cannot ignore such a widespread phenomenon.

If fifty percent of all teachers engage in moonlighting to maintain their standard of living, this fact is a staggering comment on the rewards and status of the profession. Moonlighting by teachers underscores not only the inadequacy of salaries in many states, but also the relatively low status of teaching as a profession. Any profession dependent on outside employment at this level of involvement is far more a para-profession than one of higher status.

Whatever the implications, defining moonlighting precisely is not easy. Extra earnings from jobs outside the school system are self-evident examples of moonlighting. Income above that earned as the basic salary is one basic criterion in a definition, but there are jobs held by teachers within the school system for extra pay. Should this income be counted? Some additional income is the result of hobbies or home crafts. Should these activites be considered moonlighting?

The problem is further complicated by the fact that in a state like Oklahoma, some teachers engage in ranching or farming after the school day is completed. Some of these activities blur the distinction between the prime source of income, teaching or farming. Since this income supplements the teacher's basic salary, it is considered here as moonlighting.

Given these and similiar issues, we determine our definition based on two assumptions: (1) to leave anything out of the definition would ignore the importance of monetary rewards for most individuals; and (2) school teaching is a fulltime position and any extra compensation from a school system or any other source needs to be considered. Hence, the definition of moonlighting used here includes any income earned beyond the basic contractual salary.

The Sample and Methodology

The instrument utilized to gather data was field tested with several graduate classes at the University of Oklahoma. The data from persons in those classes, mainly teachers, are not included in our results. This limited field testing procedure served to clarify questions on the instrument and led to other questions being added.

The research was conducted in cooperation with officers of the Oklahoma Education Association. The OEA has an exceptionally high percentage of teacher members in the State, the estimate being approximately 92 percent. Given this fact, the membership rolls of the Association provided a defensible source for drawing a random sample. A ten percent sample of all 1980-81 Oklahoma Education Association members was made available to the researchers. The sample consisted of 4,100 members. Each of these persons received a questionnaire through the mail and 1103 returned usable questionnaires provided the data reported here. Since this was an exploratory study, a follow-up mail procedure was not implemented.

Of the 1103 usable responses, 28.7% were from males and 71.3% female. This ratio compares closely with 1980 and 1981 figures for the number of certificates issued to new teachers in Oklahoma: approximately 28% to males and 72% to females. The median age was 39 years: 80% were married, 9% single (not previously married), 9% single (previously married), and 2% widowed. In respect to ethnicity, 3.8% were American Indian, 2.5% Black and 93.6% White.

Sixty two percent of the sample hold a baccalaureate degree (compared to 58% of all 1981 Oklahoma teachers). Thirty five percent of the sample hold a master's degree (compared to 41% of 1981 Oklahoma teachers). These comparisons are reasonably close and suggest that the sample may be representative in respect to educational attainment. The ratio of males to females in the sample and in the State is very similiar. Regretfully, the demographic characteristics of Oklahoma teaching force is not documented beyond these two characteristics and age and ethnicity cannot be compared.

In addition, the sample is classified as 74.7% classroom teacher, 19.3% special (reading teacher, media specialist, counselor, etc.), and 6.1% administrator. The mean years of experience is 12.

While the sample cannot be absolutely defended as representative of all Oklahoma teachers, none of the above comparisons are so skewed as to seriously challenge the assumption of representativeness. This assumption is reinforced by the 1980 NEA national survey of teachers that indicate: 33% are male and 67% female; 8.5% are Black, 0.4% American Indian, and 90.5% White. The increased percentage of American Indian teachers in Oklahoma is consistent with the State's heritage. The NEA sample also indicates that 46% are elementary teachers, 8% middle school teachers, 15% junior high teachers, and 30% senior high teachers. Interestingly, the median years in education in the NEA survey is 12 years, identical to our data. There is also congruence in the mean age of respondents: NEA, mean, 40 years; this sample's mean, 39 years.[13]

## A PROFILE OF MOONLIGHTING TEACHERS

To develop a profile of moonlighters, it is necessary to underscore the range of salaries earned by the teachers sampled:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2% | under | $10,000 | 47.1% | $15,001 - | $20,000 |
| 5.4% | $10,001 - | $12,000 | 11.5% | $20,001 - | $25,000 |
| 29.9% | $12,001 - | $15,000 | 5.0% | over | $25,000 |

Seventy three percent indicate that they consider the salary derived from teaching to be their primary income. Teachers were asked how satisfied they were with their present salary; Thirteen percent indicated "very satisfied", 47.1% "satisfied", 38% "dissatisfied", and 1.5% "very dissatisfied". The fact that 60% are "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their salary is intriguing. If a high proportion of teachers are satisfied with their salary, why is the incidence of moonlighting so high?

Are those satisfied with their salary more likely to be moonlighters than those dissatisfied? These questions are discussed in the next section.

Within The School System

The major form of moonlighting is within the category of extra compensation duties within the school system. Forty four percent of the respondents indicated that over the past three years they have earned supplementary income by providing services to the school district beyond their basic duties. Sixty two percent of the male teachers provide additional services to the district compared with 38% of the females.

In order of frequency, the following types of extra compensation employment were indicated: 9.2% coaching, 9.1% teacher consultant, 6.8% school bus driving, 6.5% summer school teaching, 3.2% district curriculum development or related activities, 1% drama activities, and another 20.8% in a range of other school activities.

The 44.4% figure may be inflated due to the inclusion of the "teacher consultant" category. The teacher consultant is a regularly assigned teacher who, for $500 extra per year, works with a first-year teacher under Oklahoma's new teacher education legislation. The teacher consultant is part of a three person team including a teacher, the principal and a representative of higher education charged with assisting new teachers. Because the teacher consultants work is essentially done during regular school hours, it is not the type of extra compensation employment that usually requires additional time being put into the task after school hours or during the summer, as is the case with most moonlighting activities. No generalizations can be profitably drawn regarding this new school activity without additional research. Even with the possible withdrawal of the teacher consultant activity, it is clear that a significant percentage of teachers depend on their school system for additional income.

Outside the School System

Respondents were asked how much income was derived from outside employment. Of the 31.4% who indicate that within the last 3 years they have held a job evenings or weekends in addition to their regular role as an educator, the income earned per year was $2,075. These respondents worked about 13.5 hours per week on their outside jobs. When analyzed separately for each sex, 48% of the male and 23% of the females worked outside the school system. Given that Oklahoma has almost 40,000 school teachers, these data suggest that as many as 12,000 teachers in the state may engage in this form of moonlighting.

Forty two percent of the respondents indicated that within the last three years they have held jobs during the summer for extra compensation. The summer jobs were more likely to be on a full-time basis, averaging 35.4 hours per week. The average summer income earned was $1,822. Again, there was a sizeable sex difference with 61% of all male teachers holding down summer jobs compared with 31% of the female teachers.

Family Income

Respondents were asked to report any income derived from family related businesses. Specifically, they were asked if within the last three years they had been involved in a self-owned or family business of any kind, including farming, raising horses, and so on. Twenty nine percent answered affirmatively, 71.% negatively. Those engaged in such activities indicated they spent approximately 13.6 hours per week assisting in a family business. They estimated their annual earnings at approximately $5,136 from these activities.

Respondents were asked if the income from the above sources was less than, equal to, or more than their income as a teacher. Ninety percent indicated that these activities were less than their income as a teacher; 3.6% indicated the income was equal to the earnings as a teacher; and 6.8% that they earned more in these activities

than their salary as a teacher. Clearly, the majority of teachers engaged in moonlighting do not earn much more money from family business activities. At the same time, 10.4% either equal or exceed their earnings through moonlighting activities.

Other Sources

Respondents also indicated that they received additional income from a range of other sources, i.e. rental properties, royalties, dividends or interest, oil or gas leases, retirement or pension funds, and insurance benefits. The two largest percentages of response were 16.5% from dividends or interest, and 12.5% from rental properties. No generalizations are drawn from these figures since the questionnaire did not probe beyond this superficial information. There is no way of determining whether the dividends represent a few dollars a year or significant income. There is no way of determining the extent of rental properties or the range of income they might produce.

All the data suggest a profile of the moonlighter as an educator who is likely to find some activity in the school for which extra compensation is paid. Outside the schools, the moonlighting is done weekends or evenings, with an average of 13.5 hours per week being put into this activity, with annual earnings of about $2,075. The moonlighter is a person who typically seeks a full-time position during the summer, i.e. 35.4 hours per week, and earns approximately $1,822 for these efforts. The fact that 41.5% engage in summer employment is significant given the criticism levied at teachers regarding their "long summer vacations". When all sources of outside income are combined, 71% of all teachers report some form of outside income averaging $3,917 per year.

When contrasted with the 1963-64 findings of Anderson, the economic plight of the teacher appears even more bleak. While it must be remembered that differences exist in the type of questions asked in the two studies and in the nature of outside

employment covered, the following comparisons appear worth noting. In Oklahoma, male teacher moonlighting has jumped from 69% to 90% and female teacher moonlighting has increased from 19% to 65%. The average amount of money earned moonlighting rose from about $1,100 annually in 1963-64 to about 3,800 in 1981 which seems to reflect the effect of inflation on hourly wages. These findings suggest, as teachers have argued for years, that it is not possible for many teachers to maintain their standard of living unless they find some form of outside employment. There are other reasons why a teacher would work during the summer but the need for money is clearly the prime motivation.

## MOTIVES OF MOONLIGHTING

It is clear from the data that school personnel engage in supplementary work activities on a relatively large scale. Forty four percent of all respondents earned supplementary income from school districts beyond their basic duties during the last three years. Almost one-third (31.4%) held evening or weekend jobs and 41.5% held a summer job during the past 3 years. Additionally, 28.8% indicated involvement in a family business; usually farming or ranching. (The percentages are not cumulative since these are not mutally exclusive categories.)

Our survey enabled us to make surface probes into the reasons given by respondents for their participation in supplementary employment. We asked: "What was your primary reason for taking a second job(s)? The following data summarizes the percentage of respondents choosing each alternative:

What was your primary reason for taking a second job(s)?

| | |
|---|---|
| 37.7% | needed the money to pay debts. |
| 36.5% | needed the money to enhance the family living standard. |
| 5.5% | pursuit of secondary work interest. |
| 4.7% | diversion from teaching. |
| 5.1% | preparation to leave teaching. |
| 10.6% | other (please specify). |

Two responses accounted for approximately three-quarters of the respondents' choices. Equal numbers of school personnel indicated a need either to pay debts or to enhance the family living standard. These answers are not surprising but lead to another question.

What is the relationship between satisfaction with teaching salary and likelihood of seeking additional employment? An interesting finding occurred when we compared these categories. Forty-eight percent of those individuals indicating satisfaction or strong satisfaction with their salaries sought additional jobs within the district, compared with 36% indicating dissatisfaction or strong dissatisfaction with their salaries. Why are persons satisfied with teaching more likely to moonlight? Our tentative answer is that low salaries are most likely the major cause. A second analysis involved a comparison of those individuals who had additional income from jobs outside the district either during evenings, weekends or summers. The results were similiar. Thirty-six percent of the respondents who were satisfied or very satisified with their salaries held outside jobs, compared with only 22% of those who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their salaries. Both comparisons were statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

In addition to the 75% who chose economic need as the primary motivator for seeking supplementary employment, we should not overlook the remaining 25% of all personnel who chose other reasons. Five and one-half percent were in pursuit of a secondary work interest, 4.7% sought a diversion from teaching, 5.1% were preparing to leave the profession and 10.6% gave varied and sundry reasons for working under

the "other" category. A quarter of the profession apparently is motivated by reasons other than economic need and would most likely moonlight even if economic needs were removed.

## Impact of Moonlighting

A study of moonlighting must consider its impact on the quality of teaching and learning of children. Further, what effect does supplementary employment have upon the personal, social and professional lives of educational personnel and ultimately upon the profession itself? While data measuring the impact upon learning and teaching or the actual effect of moonlighting upon the lives of teachers and administrators are not available, we are able to shed light on the perceptions of respondents regarding these questions:

Please rate each of these as to how it is affected by your supplemental employment.

| | | Helps | Hinders | Does Not Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | teaching performance | 22.4% | 19.6% | 58.0% |
| b) | preparation for teaching | 14.0% | 28.5% | 57.6% |
| c) | reading and private study | 8.7% | 51.3% | 40.0% |
| d) | advanced graduate study | 7.7% | 34.1% | 58.2% |
| e) | in service seminars/workshop | 10.3% | 58.5% | 31.2% |
| f) | physical well-being | 23.1% | 37.4% | 39.5% |

Teachers differentiated between and among the various activities in terms of perceived impact of moonlighting. Twenty percent of the respondents admitted that moonlighting hindered their teaching performance. Twenty nine percent felt their preparation for teaching was affected by outside employment. In contrast, approxi mately one-half of the respondents felt outside employment hindered their reading and private study (51.3%) and advanced graduate study (47.0%). The greatest "loser" in

competition for the teacher's time appeared to be the family: 58.5% of the respondents indicated that outside employment hindered family and social activities.

Clearly, time constraints appeared to be a concern to our educators in that no less than one-fifth and in some cases over half admitted their moonlighting activities extracted a cost, if not directly from their teaching then indirectly from family or related activities.

Another consequence of moonlighting might well be the effect of outside employment on educators' plans for remaining in the profession:

How likely is it that you will be remaining in education for the next:

| | Very Likely | Likely | Unlikely | Highly Unlikely |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) 5 years | 48.9% | 32.7% | 12.4% | 6.0% |
| b) Until you reach age retirement? | 34.0% | 28.9% | 19.2% | 17.8% |

Overall, our group of educators seemed reasonably sanguine about their prospects for remaining in education, at least for the next five years. When we examined the relationship between the likelihood of remaining in the profession and the frequency of outside employment, a rather interesting result occurred. While one would expect that those moonlighting would be more likely to leave the profession, the results are otherwise. Of the 575 individuals in our sample who had outside income within the district or from work outside the district, 112 (19.5%) indicated it was unlikely or highly unlikely that they would remain in education for the next five years, compared with 18.4% of the total sample. Clearly, the moonlighters were no more likely to leave teaching than the rest of the teaching sample.

A final question asked respondents their attitudes toward moonlighting as a practice. When asked which of the following four alternatives best represented their views, we obtained the following results:

44.3% (1) I feel supplementary work degrades the profession and I hope someday no one will have to seek secondary jobs outside of teaching.

20.2% (2) I feel teaching will always be considered less than a profession by many and while I don't like it, "moonlighting" will always be with us.

21.0% (3) I feel supplementary jobs are necessary to provide a livable income and I feel they neither help nor harm the teacher's primary role.

14.4% (4) I feel some jobs I've known could be said to enhance the professional role of education.

The results indicate a wide array of views but nearly one-half clearly reject the practice as degrading the profession and another 20% merely tolerate it. In spite of these attitudinal statements, the actual practice among educators appears quite different. Of the 593 respondents reporting outside work involvement, 258 or 43.5% expressed strong opposition to the notion of moonlighting by selecting the first option. One hundred twenty one respondents or 20.4% who had outside income, selected alternative "2". Twenty three percent of the moonlighters selected option 3, and 13.1% selected option 4. The behaviors were totally unrelated to the attitudes expressed as evidenced by a chi square which yielded a probability equal to .69. Clearly teacher attitudes toward moonlighting and participation in moonlighting are unrelated.

## IMPLICATIONS

The implications of this study derive from the major findings:

(a) 44% of the teachers responding engage in moonlighting activities within the school system;

(b) 31.4% engage in moonlighting activities weekends and evenings;

(c) 41.5% take summer jobs;

(d) 28.8% earn extra income from family related businesses;

(e) 71% of all teachers earn some additional income from one or more of the above sources.

The overall pattern is clear: An alarming number of teachers depend on some form of moonlighting to supplement their income. Ninety percent of the males and 65% of the females reported some form of additional income within the last 3 years. These data are consistent with the earlier reference to Tucker's 1968 study in Utah in which he reported 90.7% for males and 32.1% for females. Our data are more alarming in that women teachers reporting some form of additional income have doubled in number since that date and men have remained at that same high rate. This fact is consistent with a sharp increase in moonlighting by women nationally.[14] Thirty eight percent state they need the money to pay debts and 36.5% indicate they need the money to enhance their family living standard. These responses combine to underscore the economic needs that lead to moonlighting.

The most powerful implication of these findings is that any profession in which one-third or more of its members must supplement their income by a wide range of activities - - many of which pay very little - - is not a profession except in the most gross use of the term. The fact that supplementary income is needed by so many teachers seriously jeopardizes the professional status of teachers. The types of supplementary jobs taken are also not generally conducive to high professional status. While some of the jobs are related to the skills of an educator, the range of jobs suggest that teachers will engage in almost any employment that will supplement their income regardless of the social status involved.

The full impact of supplementary employment on the profession is not clear. This study did not probe beyond the information presented since its primary purpose was to establish baseline data on the extent of moonlighting in Oklahoma and the variety of activities in which teachers engage. A number of questions need to be probed if the impact of such activities is to be established. What is the impact of moonlighting on:

(1) the quality of instruction;

(2) on commitment to the profession;

(3) on the learning of students;

(4) on the energy and physical stamina of moonlighting teachers;

(5) on the self-image of teachers;

(6) on the attitudes of teachers not moonlighting toward those who do moonlight; and so on.

Our data indicate that 14.4% of the teachers believe that some moonlighting jobs may enhance their professional role. An argument can be made that some teachers benefit from a breadth of experiences outside of the classroom. This is an area of research worth pursuing. Nonetheless, our society is exceptionally status conscious. The status of the profession can hardly be enhanced with so much moonlighting by teachers.

These findings clearly support a case for an increase in teacher salaries. Those opposed to raising salaries argue that the training level of teachers and their performance do not warrant an increase and that moonlighting is not a justification. The values implicit in these two views and arguments regarding the matter are well known and need not be addressed here. They are at the core of the debate on the quality of teaching in America.

It is clear to the authors that the extent of moonlighting in teaching almost guarantees that teaching will remain a semi-profession. It is also clear that there is

an implicit "grubiness" in many moonlighting activities. The amount of money earned is hardly at the level of professional salaries; the types of jobs in which teachers engage are hardly related to the academic, intellectual, child-guiding ideals of the teaching profession.

A far more positive alternative to moonlighting is the development of a strong profession, with a level of training and responsibilities that lead to much higher compensation. We support this goal fully believing that its implementation, however difficult, is far preferable to the status quo. Those concerned with strengthening the profession will find in the data some compelling evidence to support this hope.

## NOTES


1. Thomas Toch, "Teachers Today Are Older, Poorer, and Much Less Happy with Career." Education Week, March 10, 1982.

2. Debbie Shannon, "Rewards not in paycheck." The Norman (Oklahoma) Transcript, January 28, 1982.

3. Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, chapter 4.

4. Carl Rosenfeld, "Multiple jobholding holds steady in 1978." Monthly Labor Review, vol. 102, February, 1979, pp. 59-61.

5. "Cashing in on Summer." Instructor, vol. 89, May 1980, pp. 28-29.

6. "A Look at Nation's 5 Million Moonlighters." U.S. News and World Report, vol. LXXXIX, December 8, 1980, p. 77.

7. Patricia McCormack, "Moonlighting essential for some teachers today." Houston Chronicle, February 17, 1982, p. 2.

8. Stuart A. Anderson, "A Study of the Professional Personnel of Wisconsin Secondary Schools With Special Reference to Extra-Contractual Income." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1948.

9. Melvin LeRoy Tucker, "A Study of the Salary Supplementing Activities of Utah Public School Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1965.

10. George Harris Gumm, "Salary Supplementing Activities of Male Public School Teachers in Tennessee." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1968.

11. Charles Parker, "Salary Supplementing Activities of Male Public School Teacher in Missouri," Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1969.

12. William Donald Anderson, Jr. "Supplemental Income Survey Oklahoma Classroom Teachers and Counselors K-12." Unpublished Ed.D. disseratation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.

13. "Survey of NEA Members, 1980. NEA Research Memo, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, November 1980.

14. Edward Sekscenski, "Women's share of moonlighting nearly doubles during 1969-79." Monthly Labor Review, vol. 103, May, 1980, pp. 36-39.

## Other References


Lloyd Paul Campbell, "A Study of Moonlighting Activities of Male Jefferson County Teachers." Colorado Journal of Educational Research, vol. 9, 1970, pp. 2-5.

Classroom teacher moonlights as folk singer." School Management, vol. 13, September, 1969, pp. 10-14.

Diane Divoky, "Moonlighting: Occupational Hazard or Benefit? Learning, November, 1978, pp. 40-43.

Thomas J. Fluygare, "The Legality of Prohibiting Outside Work by School Employees." Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1980, pp. 558-59.

Robert C. Howe and Neil C. Aslin, "Who Moonlights?" School and Community, November, 1970, p. 74.

Cleborne D. Maddux and Others, "A Survey of Texas Public School Teachers." ERIC Document #Ed212559 SPO 19395, 1980. This study reports 22% of the Texas teachers surveyed engage in moonlighting.

H.D. Wilsted and P.J. Bryant, "Summer Employment of Mathematics Teachers in Industry." Excellence in Mathematics Education - For All, November 1969, pp. 549 - 51.